



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,878	08/24/2001	Nila Patil	HO-P02199US2	2515
31662	7590	12/03/2003	EXAMINER	
PERLEGEN SCIENCES, INC. LEGAL DEPARTMENT 2021 STIERLIN COURT MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94043			FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/938,878	PATIL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Fredman	1634	

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --**

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Inventorship

1. In view of the papers filed October 27, 2003, it has been found that this nonprovisional application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the inventorship, and accordingly, this application has been corrected in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(a). The inventorship of this application has been changed by the addition of Kelly Frazer.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of the file jacket and PTO PALM data to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 24, 29, 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zonana et al (U.S. Patent 6,355,782) in view of Dong et al (U.S. Patent 6,361,947).

Zonana teaches a method of analyzing a subset of nucleic acids (see abstract) comprising:

(a) providing a driver population of nucleic acid and a tester population of nucleic acids (See column 22, lines 64-65 for driver and column 22, line 66 to column 23, line 8 for tester),

(b) denaturing said population of tester and driver nucleic acids (see column 23, lines 9-16),

(c) annealing the driver and tester populations to produce a single stranded subset of nucleic acids and a double stranded subset of nucleic acids (see column 23, lines 15-18),

(d) immobilizing the driver population of nucleic acids by use of a biotin-streptavidin interaction to produce an unimmobilized single stranded tester subset of nucleic acids, an immobilized double stranded tester-driver subset of nucleic acids and an immobilized single stranded driver subset of nucleic acids (see column 23, lines 18-19),

(e) separating the unimmobilized single stranded tester subset of the nucleic acids from the single and double stranded driver subset of the nucleic acids (see column 23, lines 20-21),

(f) dissociating the immobilized double stranded tester-driver subset of nucleic acids to produce a subset of complementary tester nucleic acids and a subset of immobilized complementary driver nucleic acids (see column 23, lines 22-23)

(g) separating the subset of complementary tester nucleic acids from the subset of immobilized complementary driver nucleic acids (see column 23, lines 22-23),

Zonana does not teach the steps of:

(h) hybridizing the unimmobilized single stranded tester nucleic acids to probes on a nucleic acid probe array (see page 1890, column 2, subheading "colony hybridization" and figure 3) and

(i) determining which of the probes on the array hybridizes to the single stranded tester subset of the population thereby analyzing the single stranded subset of the population of nucleic acid fragments (see page 1890, column 2, subheading "colony hybridization and figure 3).

Dong teaches the steps of

(h) hybridizing the unimmobilized single stranded tester nucleic acids to probes on a nucleic acid probe array (see column 5, lines 57-60 and column 31, claim 1)) and

(i) determining which of the probes on the array hybridizes to the single stranded tester subset of the population thereby analyzing the single stranded subset of the population of nucleic acid fragments (see column 5, lines 57-60 and column 31, claim 1).

With regard to claim 29, Zonana teaches the use of PCR products as driver (see column 22, lines 64-65).

With regard to claims 38 and 39, Zonana teaches the driver has a biotin tag and binds to streptavidin magnetic beads (see column 23, lines 18-19).

With regard to claim 40, Zonana teaches separating the subset of complementary tester nucleic acids from the subset of immobilized complementary driver nucleic acids using the biotin streptavidin interaction (see column 23, lines 22-23),

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Zonana with the detection method of Dong since Zonana wants to selected cDNA and since Dong states "In a preferred embodiment the isolated sequences are then exposed to an array which may or may not have been specifically designed and manufactured to interrogate the isolated sequences. (see column 5, lines 57-60)." An ordinary practitioner would have recognized that both Zonana and Dong were operating to reduce the complexity of their DNA sample and were selecting for subsets of the total sample. In this context, an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated by Dong to use an array in the place of the more cumbersome cloning methods used by Zonana for further analysis since Dong expressly teaches that array detection is a preferred method of analysis of the isolated subsets.

5. Claims 25-28, 30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zonana et al (U.S. Patent 6,355,782) in view of Dong et al (U.S. Patent 6,361,947) as applied to claims 24, 29 and 38-40 and further in view of Wigler et al (U.S. Patent 5,501,964).

Zonana et al (U.S. Patent 6,355,782) in view of Dong et al (U.S. Patent 6,361,947) teach the limitations of claims 24, 29 and 38-40 as discussed above.

Zonana et al (U.S. Patent 6,355,782) in view of Dong et al (U.S. Patent 6,361,947) do not teach screening fragments from human individuals or the use of two different human individuals or comparison of different species or the DNA or mRNA sources used.

Wigler teaches comparison of DNA from two sources in order to determine the relationship between the sources (See column 3, lines 11-14) including comparisons between different individuals (see column 8, lines 40-48) as well as comparisons between different species (see column 21, example 7). Wigler teaches that the sources can be cDNA, genomic DNA, restriction fragments of DNA or libraries (see column 2, lines 42-50). The cDNA drivers would necessarily be derived from noncontiguous regions of a genome of a species. Wigler also teaches comparison of PCR amplified DNA (see column 4, lines 28-37). Wigler expressly recognizes that any animal can be the source of the DNA, including mammals and non-mammals, as well as higher eukaryotes and humans.(see column 3, lines 62-67).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Zonana et al (U.S. Patent 6,355,782) in view of Dong et al (U.S. Patent 6,361,947) to utilize the different comparisons and DNA sources for comparison taught by Wigler since Wigler states

“Comparative genomic DNA analysis holds promise for the discovery of sequences which may provide for information concerning polymorphisms, infectious DNA based agents, lesions associated with disease, such as cancer, inherited dominant and recessive traits, and the like. By being able to detect particular DNA sequences which have a function or affect a function of cells, one

can monitor pedigrees, so that in breeding animals one can follow the inheritance of particular sequences associated with desirable traits. In humans, there is substantial interest in forensic medicine, diagnostics and genotyping, and determining relationships between various individuals. There is, therefore, substantial interest in providing techniques which allow for the detection of common sequences between sources and sequences which differ between sources. (Column 1, lines 23-37)."

An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to apply the tester driver method of Zonana et al (U.S. Patent 6,355,782) in view of Dong et al (U.S. Patent 6,361,947) on comparisons between individuals and between species in order to identify desirable traits, as expressly suggested by Wigler, as well as identifying relationships between individuals and species as suggested by Wigler. An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to focus on a comparison of unique sequences as taught by Straus in the broad variety of contexts suggested by Wigler.

Further, with regard to the order of the steps of immobilization, annealing and denaturation, as MPEP 2144.04 notes "selection of any order of performing process steps is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results". In this case, this is particularly true since the order of the steps would not be expected to impact the results of the method. Whether immobilization was performed prior to the annealing or denaturation steps would not be expected to effect the reaction since the interaction is between the nucleic acids, which are equally available whether immobilized or not.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed October 27, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of Zonana and Dong does not render the current claims obvious because Zonana is focused on cDNA selection to isolate a desired cDNA fragment that was derived from mouse dl RNA and that Zonana does not teach or suggest the use of an array to identify the cloned cDNA molecule resulting from the selection. Applicant further argues that the combination of Zonana with Dong would interfere with the method of Zonana since arrays are incompatible with isolation of a full length cloned cDNA molecule. Applicant concludes by arguing that it is not clear how Dong assists the method of Zonana.

Applicant's first argument appears to focus on the specificity of Zonana's use. That is, Applicant argues that Zonana would not want to array the products for analysis. This is simply not correct. Zonana concludes the tester driver method by stating that after ligation of the cDNA products into a vector, "The amplified cDNA from this second enrichment was ligated into pT-Adv (Clontech) and transformed into E. coli. Bacteria were grown on gridded plates prior to further analysis (see column 23, lines 29-32)." In fact, the cDNAs were actually placed into an array, the gridded plates, in the form of ligated plasmids in the E. coli bacteria. Zonana expressly indicates that this placement is made to permit further analysis, which analysis includes DNA sequencing (see column 24), expression analysis (see column 26), haplotype analysis (see column 39), as well as an express suggestion for the use of DNA chips for mutation detection at column 54, lines 5-9. So Zonana clearly wished to further analyze the molecules being formed and Zonana recognized many different modes of analysis, all of which may rely

upon DNA arrays, including expression analysis, haplotype analysis and mutation detection.

Applicant's second argument is also addressed by the argument above since it is clear that the array of Dong would assist with the subsequent analysis of Zonana's sequences for mutation analysis, for example, by providing an array on which different mutants could be placed (as taught by Zonana at column 54) and their presence or absence analyzed by the array of Dong (see column 31, claim 1). Further, the method of Dong, which analyzes the complexity of samples using arrays, would combine very well with the method of Zonana, in which the complexity of the sample is first reduced by the use of the tester-driver method, since an ordinary practitioner, interested in performing the analyses of Zonana, ranging from haplotype analysis to mutation detection, would have been motivated to use the arrays of Dong in order "to interrogate the isolated sequences (see column 5, lines 57-60 of Dong)." This interrogation may take multiple forms, ranging from sequence determination to mutation, expression or haplotype analysis, but the teachings of Zonana and Dong are not only compatible but complementary.

Finally, Applicant argues that no advantage results in the combination of the methods. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, there is abundant motivation to combine the references of Zonana and Dong since the combination permits interrogation of the sequences isolated by Zonana to determine if these sequences are wildtype or mutant, if these sequences have one haplotype or another haplotype, or if these sequences have the sequence expected for the dl nucleic acid or not. Thus, an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated by Dong to interrogate the selected products of Zonana for a variety of different analyses, all of the analyses being ones expressly suggested by Zonana.

Applicant then argues the 103 further in view of Wigler by relying upon overcoming the primary 103 rejection. Since that rejection is maintained, so is the 103 rejection over Wigler.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is 703-308-6568. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 703-308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Jeffrey Fredman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634

June 24, 2003